

**CONFIDENTIAL**

Copy  
RM L53I14

NACA RM L53I14

TECH LIBRARY KAFB, NM  
0144334

**NACA**

# RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS IN PITCH OF A SERIES OF  
CRUCIFORM-WING MISSILES WITH CANARD CONTROLS

AT A MACH NUMBER OF 2.01

By M. Leroy Spearman

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory  
Langley Field, Va.

CLASSIFIED DOCUMENT

This material contains information affecting the National Defense of the United States within the meaning of the espionage laws, Title 18, U.S.C., Secs. 793 and 794, the transmission or revelation of which in any manner to an unauthorized person is prohibited by law.

**NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FOR AERONAUTICS**

WASHINGTON

October 30, 1953

**CONFIDENTIAL**

RECEIVED FOR ..... Unclassified .....)

NASA Tech Pub Announcement #14  
(OFFICE AUTHORIZED TO CHANGE)

..... 3. March .....

NK  
.....  
(NAME OF OFFICER MAKING CHANGE)

21 Feb. 61 .....  
DATE

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

0144334

## NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

## RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

AERODYNAMIC CHARACTERISTICS IN PITCH OF A SERIES OF  
CRUCIFORM-WING MISSILES WITH CANARD CONTROLS

AT A MACH NUMBER OF 2.01

By M. Leroy Spearman

## SUMMARY

An investigation has been conducted in the Langley 4- by 4-foot supersonic pressure tunnel at a Mach number of 2.01 to determine the static longitudinal stability and control characteristics of a series of missile configurations with canard controls at angles of attack up to about  $28^\circ$ . The missiles had cruciform wings and canard surfaces of delta plan form with  $70^\circ$  swept leading edges. Five bodies having fineness ratios of 19.1, 17.7, 16.7, 15.7, and 14.8 were investigated.

The results of the investigation indicated a large nonlinear variation of pitching moment with angle of attack for the body of largest fineness ratio that was progressively reduced by decreasing the fineness ratio until it was essentially eliminated for a body of fineness ratio 14.8. The increased linearity of the moment curve would make it possible to reduce the margin of stability so that, for a given canard size and deflection, a higher trim angle of attack might be obtained for the shortest missile than for the longest missile.

The pitching-moment results indicated that methods of prediction which assumed linear variations with angle of attack for the wing-alone and wing-plus-interference characteristics were adequate for angles of attack up to about  $12^\circ$ . At higher angles of attack it was evident that the characteristics of these components were nonlinear and that more refined methods would be required for adequate prediction.

## INTRODUCTION

In connection with the development of missile configurations with canard controls an investigation has been conducted in the Langley 4- by 4-foot supersonic pressure tunnel to determine the aerodynamic

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

characteristics and interference effects for a series of such configurations at angles of attack up to about  $28^\circ$  and at high combined angles of attack and angles of sideslip. The models investigated had cruciform wings and canard surfaces of delta plan form with  $70^\circ$  swept leading edges and were equipped with all-movable canard surfaces for both pitch and yaw control and movable wing-tip ailerons for roll control. Various component parts of the models could be removed or changed in order to facilitate the investigation of general interference effects between different components and to permit the investigation of various modifications to the model.

Six-component force and moment measurements were made through an angle range from  $-2^\circ$  to about  $28^\circ$  at various roll angles from  $0^\circ$  to  $90^\circ$ . A resolution of these results provides the aerodynamic characteristics for the missiles at angles of attack up to about  $28^\circ$  at zero sideslip or at combinations of angle of attack and angle of sideslip up to a maximum of about  $20^\circ$  for each.

This paper presents the results of tests made at a Mach number of 2.01 to determine the effect of body length on the longitudinal characteristics (zero roll angle) for five complete configurations as well as for the bodies alone, the bodies plus wings, and the bodies plus canard surfaces. The experimental results are compared with some simple theoretical estimates.

#### COEFFICIENTS AND SYMBOLS

The results of the tests are presented as standard NACA coefficients of forces and moments. The data are referred to the body-axis system (fig. 1) with the moment reference point for all configurations located 6.25 body diameters forward of the base of the body ( $-19.5$  percent of the wing mean aerodynamic chord).

The coefficients and symbols are defined as follows:

$C_N$	normal-force coefficient ( $N/qS$ )
$C_C$	chord-force coefficient ( $C/qS$ )
$C_m$	pitching-moment coefficient ( $M'/qS\bar{c}$ )
$N$	normal force
$C$	chord force

$M'$	pitching moment
$q$	free-stream dynamic pressure
$S$	total wing area resulting from extending the wing leading edge and trailing edge to the body center line
$\bar{c}$	wing mean aerodynamic chord
$l_t$	tail length measured from the moment reference point to the $\frac{2}{3}$ -root-chord point of horizontal canard
$x$	distance from nose along body center line
$\Delta x$	longitudinal shift in moment reference point, positive rearward
$M$	Mach number
$\alpha$	angle of attack, deg
$\alpha_{trim}$	angle of attack at $C_m = 0$ , deg
$\delta_H$	horizontal-canard deflection, deg
$C_{m\alpha}$	rate of change of pitching-moment coefficient with angle of attack $(\partial C_m / \partial \alpha)$
$C_{m\delta}$	rate of change of pitching-moment coefficient with horizontal canard deflection at $\alpha = 0^\circ$ $(\partial C_m / \partial \delta_H)$
$\alpha_{\delta trim}$	rate of change of angle of attack with horizontal canard deflection at $C_m = 0$ $(\partial \alpha / \partial \delta_H)$

Subscript 45 refers to wing plane being rotated  $45^\circ$  with respect to the horizontal plane.

#### MODEL AND APPARATUS

Sketches of the models are shown in figure 2. The geometric characteristics of the models are presented in table I.

The body of the model was composed of a parabolic nose followed by a frustum of a cone which was faired into a cylinder. The body length was varied through the use of different lengths of the cylindrical portions inserted between the canard section and the wing section. Resulting

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

body fineness ratios were 19.1, 17.7, 16.7, 15.7, and 14.8. Coordinates for the body are given in table II. The canard surfaces and the wing had delta plan forms with  $70^\circ$  swept leading edges and hexagonal sections. The horizontal canard (pitch control) was motor-driven and deflections could be set by remote control.

Force measurements were made through the use of a 6-component internal strain-gage balance. The model was mounted in the tunnel on a remotely controllable rotary-type sting. The angle-of-attack range was from  $-2^\circ$  to about  $28^\circ$ .

## TESTS AND CORRECTIONS

### Test Conditions

The conditions for the tests were:

Mach number . . . . .	2.01
Reynolds number, based on $\bar{c}$ . . . . .	$3.47 \times 10^6$
Stagnation pressure, atm . . . . .	1.0
Stagnation temperature, $^\circ\text{F}$ . . . . .	110

The stagnation dew point was maintained sufficiently low ( $-25^\circ\text{F}$  or less) so that no condensation effects were encountered in the test section.

### Corrections and Accuracy

The angle of attack was corrected for the deflection of the balance and sting under load. The Mach number variation in the test section was approximately  $\pm 0.01$  and the flow-angle variation in the vertical and horizontal planes did not exceed about  $\pm 0.1^\circ$ . No corrections were applied to the data to account for these flow variations. The base pressure was measured and the chord force was adjusted to a base pressure equal to the free-stream static pressure.

The estimated errors in the individual measured quantities are as follows:

$C_N$ . . . . .	$\pm 0.004$
$C_C$ . . . . .	$\pm 0.002$
$C_m$ . . . . .	$\pm 0.0004$
$\alpha$ , deg . . . . .	$\pm 0.1$
$\delta_H$ , deg . . . . .	$\pm 0.1$

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The variation of  $C_N$ ,  $C_C$ , and  $C_m$  with  $\alpha$  is presented in figure 3 for the five complete model missile configurations. Data for wings rotated  $45^\circ$  are presented for models 1 and 4. Results for several values of  $\delta_H$  are shown for all but model 5, for which data at only  $\delta_H = 0^\circ$  were obtained. The configurations for which results are presented are identified herein by the following designations:

Complete model (Body with wing and canard control)	BWC
Body with wing	BW
Body with canard control	BC
Body alone	B

A comparison of the variation of  $C_m$  with  $\alpha$  for the different body lengths is shown in figure 4 for the BWC, BW, BC, and B configurations. It should be pointed out that these results are for a constant moment-reference-point location with respect to the base of the model; hence, the changes in the characteristics of the model result from changes in body length and canard location ahead of the moment reference point. The effects to be expected from varying the moment reference point are discussed subsequently.

The variation of  $C_N$  with  $\alpha$  for the various component parts of the models is shown in figure 5. The estimated variation of  $C_N$  with  $\alpha$  for the body alone (fig. 5(d)) was obtained by the method of reference 1. The estimated variation of  $C_N$  with  $\alpha$  for the BW and BC configurations was obtained by the method suggested in reference 2 which entails combining the isolated wing or canard normal force (obtained in this case from ref. 3) and the normal force due to wing-body interference (ref. 2) with the body-alone results obtained by the method of reference 1.

The variation of  $C_C$  with  $\alpha$  for the various configurations is presented in figure 6.

A breakdown of the pitching-moment characteristics of the various models is shown in figure 7. The estimated curve for the body alone was obtained by the method of reference 1. The center-of-pressure locations for the BW and BC configurations were obtained by the method of reference 4 and were used in conjunction with the estimated  $C_N$  values to determine the variation of  $C_m$  with  $\alpha$ .

The constructed curves for the complete models obtained from the experimentally determined results for the component parts  $[(BC - B) + BW]$  differ only slightly from the experimental results for the complete model. This result is an indication that all of the missiles are relatively free of canard wake and downwash effects. The minor effect on the pitching-moment variation with  $\alpha$  resulting from rotating the wing  $45^\circ$  on models 1 and 4 (figs. 3(b) and 3(f)) is also an indication of little effect of the canard flow field on the wing. The variation of  $C_m$  with  $\alpha$  for the complete models appears to depend largely upon the characteristics of the body alone for these configurations. However, a comparison between the experimentally determined and the estimated variation of  $C_m$  with  $\alpha$  for the body-alone and body-wing configurations (fig. 7) indicates that even if the body-alone results could be predicted exactly, there would still be differences at angles of attack beyond about  $12^\circ$  for the body-wing configuration. The indications are that more consideration must be given to the estimated variations for the wing-alone and wing-plus-interference results at higher angles of attack (which present theoretical methods considered to be linear) before more exact agreement between estimated and experimental results might be expected for the complete configurations.

The variation of the center-of-pressure location with angle of attack for each configuration as determined from the experimental results is shown in figure 8. The effects of these center-of-pressure variations will be apparent in the moment variations to be discussed later.

The variation of  $C_m$  at  $\alpha = 0$  and  $\alpha_{trim}$  with  $\delta_H$  for models 1, 2, 3, and 4 is shown in figure 9. The variation of  $\alpha_{trim}$  with  $\delta_H$  for model 1 is that obtained from the stable portion of the pitching-moment curves only. At higher angles of attack second trim points are obtained which result in a negative slope of these curves. The moment-producing ability of the control is, of course, decreased with a decrease in moment arm. However, the fact that the pitching-moment variation with angle of attack becomes more linear as the body length is decreased may make it possible to reduce the static margin for the shorter configurations so that the control effectiveness might be substantially increased. Some estimates have been made of the effect of shifting the moment reference (center-of-gravity) location by various amounts for models 1 and 5. The results (fig. 10) indicated that the variation of  $C_m$  with  $\alpha$  for the short-body missile (model 5) would tend to become nonlinear when the static margin is reduced but to a slightly lesser extent than for the long-body missile (model 1). Conversely, when the stability of the long-body missile (model 1) was increased the moment variation became considerably more linear but was still less linear than for the short-body missile. The indications are, then, that although the effect of shortening



the body is not as great when equal low angle stability is considered, the moment variation for the shorter missile is still more linear than that for the longer missile.

An additional point to be considered in regard to the moment-reference location is that, from a geometrical or weight-distribution standpoint, it may be more practical to obtain the desired center-of-gravity location for the shorter missile than for the longer missile.

The variation with tail length of  $\alpha_{\text{trim}}$ , of  $C_{m\alpha}$  for the models with and without the wings, and of  $C_{m\delta}$  for the complete models at  $\alpha = 0^\circ$  is presented in figure 11. The variations of  $C_{m\alpha}$  and  $C_{m\delta}$  with tail length are essentially linear. The negligible effect of the canard wake on the wing is shown by the fact that the variation of  $C_{m\alpha}$  with tail length is the same either with or without the wing.

For linear variations of  $C_{m\alpha}$  and for constant values of  $C_{m\delta}$  with  $\alpha$ , the control-effectiveness parameter  $\alpha_\delta$  may be determined simply as  $\alpha_\delta = \frac{C_{m\delta}}{C_{m\alpha}}$ . However, the values of  $\alpha_{\text{trim}}$  obtained experimentally (fig. 11) are equivalent to about  $0.9 \frac{C_{m\delta}}{C_{m\alpha}}$  because  $C_{m\delta}$  decreases with  $\alpha$ . The relation  $\alpha_\delta = 0.9 \left( \frac{C_{m\delta}}{C_{m\alpha}} \right)$  might be used, then, to estimate the control effectiveness for different moment reference locations. For this purpose the variation of  $C_{m\alpha}$  with moment reference location as obtained from figure 10 has been included on figure 11 for models 1 and 5. These variations in  $C_{m\alpha}$  are much greater than those shown for the different body lengths since relocation of the moment reference point results in a change in the moment arm to the wing normal force which is the pre-dominant normal-force component. The variation of  $C_{m\delta}$  with tail length at  $\alpha = 0$  will be the same regardless of whether the moment reference location is shifted or the body length is changed. It was estimated that a moment reference shift of  $-0.1\bar{c}$  would be required for model 1 in order to prevent the occurrence of second trim points and that a shift in the moment reference point of  $0.2\bar{c}$  could be tolerated for model 5 without the occurrence of second trim points. Using the values of  $C_{m\delta}$  and  $C_{m\alpha}$  for these changes in the moment reference location, the resulting  $\alpha_{\text{trim}}$  was found to be 0.74 for model 5 and 0.58 for model 1. The indication is, then, that because of the more linear variation of  $C_m$  with

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

$\alpha$  for the shorter missile a higher usable  $\alpha_{\text{trim}}$  can be obtained than can be had for the longer missile.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

The results of tests made at a Mach number of 2.01 of the aerodynamic characteristics in pitch for a series of missile configurations with canard controls and body fineness ratios varying from 19.1 to 14.8 indicated that the canard wake effects were small and that the static longitudinal stability characteristics were influenced considerably by the characteristics of the body alone.

A large nonlinear variation of pitching moment with angle of attack for the longest body configuration tested (fineness ratio 19.1) was progressively reduced by shortening the body length until it was essentially eliminated for a body of fineness ratio 14.8. This reduction in length resulted in a decrease in the pitching effectiveness of the canard control but the increased stability and the linearity of the moment variation with angle of attack was such that a reduction in static margin could be permitted so that the usable trim angle-of-attack variation with control deflection would be higher for the shortest missile than for the longest missile.

The pitching-moment results indicated that methods of prediction which assumed linear variations with angle of attack for the wing-alone and wing-plus-interference characteristics were adequate for angles of attack up to about  $12^\circ$ . At higher angles of attack it was evident that the characteristics of these components were nonlinear and that more refined methods would be required for adequate prediction.

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory,  
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics,  
Langley Field, Va., August 25, 1953.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

## REFERENCES

1. Allen, H. Julian: Estimation of the Forces and Moments Acting on Inclined Bodies of Revolution of High Fineness Ratio. NACA RM A9I26, 1949.
2. Nielsen, Jack N., and Kaattari, George E.: Method for Estimating Lift Interference of Wing-Body Combinations at Supersonic Speeds. NACA RM A51J04, 1951.
3. Ribner, Herbert S., and Malvestuto, Frank S., Jr.: Stability Derivatives of Triangular Wings at Supersonic Speeds. NACA Rep. 908, 1948. (Supersedes NACA TN 1572.).
4. Kaattari, George E., Nielsen, Jack N., and Pitts, William C.: Method for Estimating Pitching-Moment Interference of Wing-Body Combinations at Supersonic Speed. NACA RM A52B06, 1952.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

TABLE I  
GEOMETRIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MODEL

## Wings:

Span, in. . . . .	11.853
Chord at body center line, in. . . . .	17.069
Chord at body intersection, in. . . . .	13.407
Area (leading and trailing edges extended to body center line) sq in. . . . .	104.8
Area (exposed) sq in. . . . .	64.16
Aspect ratio . . . . .	1.404
Sweep angle of leading edge, deg . . . . .	70
Thickness ratio at body center line . . . . .	.0147
Leading-edge angle normal to leading edge, deg . . . . .	15.6
Trailing-edge angle normal to trailing edge, deg . . . . .	7.4
Mean aerodynamic chord, in. . . . .	11.48

## Canard surfaces:

Area (exposed) sq. in. . . . .	6.406
Aspect ratio . . . . .	1.73
Sweep angle of leading edge, deg . . . . .	70
Mean aerodynamic chord, in. . . . .	2.576

## Body:

Maximum diameter, in. . . . .	2.666
Base area, sq. in. . . . .	5.583
Length (model 1), in. . . . .	50.833
Length (model 2), in. . . . .	47.333
Length (model 3), in. . . . .	44.667
Length (model 4), in. . . . .	42.000
Length (model 5), in. . . . .	39.565
Fineness ratio (model 1) . . . . .	19.1
Fineness ratio (model 2) . . . . .	17.7
Fineness ratio (model 3) . . . . .	16.7
Fineness ratio (model 4) . . . . .	15.7
Fineness ratio (model 5) . . . . .	14.8

NACA

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

TABLE II  
BODY COORDINATES IN INCHES

Body station	Radius
0 (Nose)	0
.297	.076
.627	.156
.956	.233
1.285	.307
1.615	.378
1.945	.445
2.275	.509
2.605	.573
2.936	.627
3.267	.682
3.598	.732
3.929	.780
4.260	.824
4.592	.865
4.923	.903
5.255	.940
5.587	.968
5.920	.996
6.252	1.020
6.583	1.042
11.542	1.333
50.833	1.333

} Conical section

} Cylindrical

NACA

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~




Figure 1.- System of body axes. Arrows indicate positive values and directions.






Figure 2.- Details of models. (All dimensions in inches.)

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Wing panel



Canard control panel

Figure 2.- Concluded.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~




(a) Model 1;  $l/d = 19.1$ .

Figure 3.- Aerodynamic characteristics in pitch for various complete model configurations.



~~CONFIDENTIAL~~(b) Model 1 with wings rotated  $45^\circ$ .

Figure 3.- Continued.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



(c) Model 2;  $l/d = 17.7$ .

Figure 3.- Continued.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL



(d) Model 3;  $l/d = 16.7$ .

Figure 3.- Continued.


CONFIDENTIAL



(e) Model 4;  $l/d = 15.7$ .


Figure 3.- Continued.

CONFIDENTIAL



(f) Model 4; wings rotated  $45^\circ$ .

Figure 3.- Continued.



(g) Model 5;  $l/d = 14.8$ ;  $\delta_H = 0^\circ$ .

Figure 3.- Concluded.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



~~CONFIDENTIAL~~(a) Complete model;  $\delta_H = 0^\circ$ .

Figure 4.- Comparison of pitching-moment variation with angle of attack for various body lengths.


~~CONFIDENTIAL~~





(b) Body-wing configuration.


Figure 4.- Continued.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

(c) Body-canard configuration;  $\delta_H = 0^\circ$ .

Figure 4.- Continued.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



(d) Body alone.

Figure 4.- Concluded.



~~CONFIDENTIAL~~(a) Complete model;  $\delta_H = 0^\circ$ .

Figure 5.- Variation of normal-force coefficient with angle of attack for various models. Flagged symbols are for models with wings rotated  $45^\circ$ .

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



(b) Body-wing configuration.

Figure 5.- Continued.

CONFIDENTIAL



(c) Body-canard configuration,  $\delta_H = 0^\circ$ .

Figure 5.- Continued.

CONFIDENTIAL



(d) Body alone.

Figure 5.- Concluded.




Figure 6.- Variation of chord-force coefficient with angle of attack for various configurations.





(a) Model 1;  $l/d = 19.1$ .

Figure 7.- Pitching-moment breakdown for various models.



(b) Model 2;  $l/d = 17.7$ .

Figure 7.- Continued.


~~CONFIDENTIAL~~(c) Model 3;  $l/d = 16.7$ .

Figure 7.- Continued.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL



(d) Model 4;  $l/d = 15.7$ .

Figure 7.- Continued.

CONFIDENTIAL



(e) Model 5;  $l/d = 14.8$ .

Figure 7.- Concluded.


~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Figure 8.- Center-of-pressure locations for various configurations.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~




Figure 8.- Concluded.


~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Figure 9.- Horizontal-canard-control characteristics for various models.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



CONFIDENTIAL





Figure 10.- Effect of center-of-gravity location on the pitching-moment characteristics of two models.


~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Figure 11.- Variation of  $C_{m_\alpha}$ ,  $C_{m_\delta}$ , and  $\alpha_{\delta_{trim}}$  with tail length.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~